DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 654 CS 205 753

AUTHOR Nowell, Bob
TITLE The Role of the International Organization of Journalists in the Debate about the "New International Information Order," 1958-1978.
PUB DATE Aug 80
NOTE 25p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (63rd, Boston, MA, August 9-13, 1980. Some pages may not reproduce clearly.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Communications; *Communism; Developing Nations; Foreign Countries; *International Organizations; *Journalism; *News Media
IDENTIFIERS *International Organization of Journalists

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the International Organization of Journalists (IOJ), which it identifies as a Soviet-dominated organization. The paper suggests that the IOJ has capitalized on "Third World" countries' discontent with Western news media by offering itself as the ideological leader and trainer of anti-Western journalists. It then examines the function and methods of the IOJ in the context of post-World War II communist international front organizations; reviews the IOJ's structure, publications, and training centers; and explores its role in shaping "Third World" arguments in the debate about the New Information Order. The paper argues that the IOJ's efforts generally have served Soviet foreign policy on international communications. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED189654

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE ROLE OF THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF JOURNALISTS IN THE DEBATE ABOUT THE "NEW INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION ORDER," 1958-1978

by

Bob Nowell
Doctoral Student

School of Journalism
Indiana University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bob Nowell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presented as the Second Place Winner in the James W. Markham Student Competition of the International Communication Division, Association for Education in Journalism Annual Convention, Boston, Mass., August 1980.

CS205753

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

In the 1970s UNESCO has become the forum for vehement debate about the nature and function of mass communications media, especially with respect to content rather than techniques of transmission. Having acquired a numerical majority in the United Nations since World War II, the "Third World" countries have become an established force in international politics. They have demanded that the UN and its specialized agencies take the lead in creating a "New International Economic Order," and in recent years their arguments have been shaped by the realization that such a new order cannot happen without the creation of a "New International Information Order." In seeking to find methods of development not dictated either by the capitalist world system or the Soviet-dominated bloc of countries, the "Third World" seeks international agreements that would protect national sovereignty from "cultural imperialism" emanating from any sphere of influence.

The "Third World's" attacks, however, have concentrated on the West; in particular, on the West's "Big Four" transnational news agencies and on direct satellite broadcasting, which they see as agents of capitalist world system expansionism. Generally speaking, their one point of agreement is the belief that they are dominated and exploited by the industrialized countries. The radical states attribute to the developed countries a conscious ideological hostility. The more moderate states believe the developed countries may unwittingly support a system that perpetuates social and economic injustice.

In turn, the West tends to view the insistence that states, through controls on mass media, can best address indigenous needs as a threat to the "free flow of information" doctrine, which is the communications expression of laissez-faire capitalism. Moreover, some Western analysts,

continuing to think in terms of irresistible appeals to "primitive" peoples of a Soviet-led monolithic world communist movement, reduce the diversity of attempts to find new press models to the level of confrontational politics between great powers.

> The Soviet Union, for its own nationalist purposes, is the principal purveyor of Marxist ideology as the model for replacing the free flow of information with tightly-knit, centralized control of all information media in the pattern of a communist society.[1]

Conversely, there can be no doubt that the Soviet Union saw in the unity of "Third World" resistance to economic determinism an opportunity to enhance its political standing with these countries by offering ideological leadership in the struggle against Western "cultural imperialism." The primary mechanism for this leadership is a front organization, the International Organization of Journalists (IOJ). The IOJ publishes vast amounts of media texts and periodicals, operates training centers for foreign journalists, arranges "solidarity" conferences in the "Third World," and in recent years has collaborated with UNESCO in research on national communications policies. Some Western analysts have attributed to the IOJ considerable influence in the "Third World" in shaping the perspective of the latter countries in the debate about the "New International Information Order." These analysts see this influence enabling the Soviet Union to orchestrate votes in UNESCO to obtain agreements which would serve Soviet, not "Third World" interests.[2]

This paper will examine the function and methods of the IOJ in the context of post-World War II communist international front organizations. It will review IOJ structure, publications and training centers. Finally, it will review the IOJ's role in shaping "Third World" arguments in the debate about the "New Information Order"--a role which the organization

established for itself in 1958. It will be argued that the IOJ's efforts generally have well served Soviet foreign policy on international communications, although the primary objective of that policy--the attainment of international sanction for authoritarian mass media systems--remains unrealized.

THE REVIVAL OF FRONT ORGANIZATIONS

During World War II most of the communist front organizations organized by the Comintern were liquidated. Sworakowski writes that "in the atmosphere of friendship with the Soviet ally," communist and procommunist movements reached "unprecedented strength" in many countries between 1941 and 1945.[3]

> These pro-Soviet elements all over the world were now used to capture existing professional organizations which for all practical purposes became communist fronts of a new type. Communist leadership in these organizations was disguised, and procommunists without party affiliation, or with secret, "underground" party ties, were placed in leading positions.[4]

Orth writes that the communist fronts have had "as their objective the accomplishment of precisely defined tasks set by world communism." Among these duties are:

> 1. Promotion of world communism by means of propaganda which attacks and defames "imperialist" states and defends and idealizes the "socialist" camp.
>
> 2. Attraction of non-communists to communism in such a manner that they are first induced to subscribe to certain, mostly very worthy objectives, which are so formulated as to correspond to communist policies. The target population or group is thus made to sympathize with certain aspects of communist foreign policy demands and provide the communists with a malleable element which can be further subjected to subtle indoctrination in the desired direction.
>
> 3. In countries in which communist parties are forbidden or have not yet developed, the front organizations are required at least in part to act as

> cover organs and operate in place of such parties in order to implant communist influence in the nation's life....[5]

According to Merris, the histories of all international front organizations "followed an identical pattern....they were at first sufficiently tolerant to allow for divergent opinion. They split when it became clear beyond doubt that the organizations were exclusively devoted to support of Soviet political warfare against the West and of communist military actions in Asia."[6] In other words, Sworakowski writes, reactions of the organizations to such events as the communist takeover of Czechoslovakia, the cold war, the Korean war, and the Berlin blockade exposed their support of the Soviet Union. In each case, "representatives of the non-communist countries consequently denounced these organizations as communist fronts and left them."[7]

IOJ: THE EARLY YEARS

The early history of the IOJ clearly follows this pattern of communist takeover. Formed in June 1946 at a congress in Copenhagen, the IOJ originally comprised journalists of national unions and groups from 21 communist and non-communist countries.[8] The International Federation of Journalists (IFJ) and the International Federation of Journalists of Allied and Free Countries both formally disbanded and merged with the IOJ.[9] The IOJ's headquarters originally were in London, and its president was a British journalist, Archibald Kenyon. At its founding, the IOJ was "the most representative organization of its type in the world," according to Orth.[10] It secured consultative status with the UN and its agencies in 1947.[11]

However, communists captured many of the key executive posts in the IOJ; and by the time of its second congress, held in June 1947 in Prague, "serious ideological disputes" had surfaced within its ranks.[12] IOJ

headquarters were permanently relocated in Prague in that year.

Following the Soviet line on the split with Yugoslavia in 1948, the IOJ expelled its Yugoslav members. United States representatives resigned from the IOJ when, in November 1948, the IOJ executive committee, meeting in Budapest, adopted a resolution accusing Western journalists of warmongering.[13] In October 1949 Kenyon resigned as president, claiming that the IOJ had become "a branch office of the Cominform."[14] By 1950 all non-communist organizations had withdrawn their affiliations. In July of that year the IOJ lost its consultative status with the UN Economic and Social Council because, Popov writes, its "partisanship had become so pronounced."[15]

The third IOJ congress, convened in Helsinki in September 1950, elected as president Jean-Maurice Hermann, secretary-general of the French Journalists' Union, an affiliate of the communist-controlled General Confederation of Labor, and editor-in-chief of Cahiers Internationaux, a communist monthly published in Paris.[16] Hermann was to serve as IOJ president until 1976. The many vice presidents have included presidents of the USSR Union of Journalists (who also serve as Pravda editors), the chairman of the Polish Press Agency, and the vice president of the All-Chinese Union of Journalists.[17]

Popov writes that until Stalin died in 1953 the IOJ's pronouncements and the "tenor of its publications" were "of a highly sectarian nature."[18] "The organization was particularly strident in its denunciations of the UN intervention in Korea, publishing atrocity stories, including the fraudulent 'germ warfare' charges directed against the UN troops."[19] It insisted that in the non-communist world, "freedom of the press and of journalists" must be defended against "the influence of monopolies and finance groups"; and it opposed any journalistic activity in the service

of persons or groups whose "interests are directed against the working masses."[20]

By 1955, however, "in line with the new Soviet approach to international relations, the IOJ had developed a more conciliatory stance toward the West." It directed a "unity campaign" at the IFJ, which had been reformed in May 1952 by non-communist groups which had quit the IOJ. But the IFJ refused to cooperate with the IOJ in the latter's calls for regional and world conferences of journalists. The International Committee for Cooperation of Journalists (ICCJ), created by an IOJ conference in Finland in June 1956, was not able to attract any IFJ members. Most of the ICCJ's officers were also leading members of the IOJ, according to Staar.[22]

The IOJ made no comment on the Soviet crushing of the Hungarian revolt and on its near-intervention in the Polish situation of 1956, and this stance apparently created "internal difficulties" which caused the organization temporarily to "stagnate."[23] By the fourth congress in May 1958, however, the IOJ was ready to resume its activities, "with a noticeable slant toward the underdeveloped countries."[24] The history of this campaign will be dealt with in a later section of this paper.

IOJ STRUCTURE, PUBLICATIONS, TRAINING PROGRAMS

National journalists' unions or associations, groups of journalists and "individuals engaged in journalism" are eligible for membership in the IOJ. In 1955 the organization claimed to have 60,000 members in 51 countries;[25] in 1965, 110,000 members in 80 Countries;[26] and in 1976, 150,000 members in 109 countries.[27] The main IOJ association has always been the All-Union Federation of Soviet Journalists,[24] which in 1976 claimed to have 60,000 members.

The congress, the highest IOJ body, has met eight times since 1946. It elects the executive committee, made up of the presidium (president, vice president and secretary general), other officers (secretaries and treasurer), and ordinary members.[30] The presidium conducts business between meetings of the executive committee; the general secretariat, which works under the presidium, handles administrative work, including finance and publications.[31]

The IOJ has been called "the world's most prolific author and publisher of books, texts, guides, pamphlets and magazines on all phases of news communication."[32] It has a permanent staff larger than that of many newspapers.[33] Its five magazines include the bi-weekly Journalists' Affairs and the monthly The Democratic Journalist, which contain technical and analytical articles addressed particularly to "Third World" journalists. Both magazines are in English, French, Russian and Spanish editions.

To examine the content of several issues of The Democratic Journalist is to learn much about the nature of the IOJ and about those who are sympathetic to its viewpoints. Its articles discuss every level of news media skill--from that expected of a journalism school dean to that of a photographer or reporter. In recent years, almost every issue contains at least one article devoted to the "disequilibrium of information" or the "one-way flow of information" from rich industrialized to poor underdeveloped countries. The empirical research on which many of these articles are founded[34] offers indisputable proof that "the media are American," lending support to the "conspiracy" and "cultural imperialist" theses. The Democratic Journalist also occasionally devotes an entire issue to polemical histories, such as the 1977 issue on the role of the socialist press in the class struggle in the 60 years following the Russian Revolution.

It is probably true, as some Western analysts claim, that the majority

of the authors in The Democratic Journalist are Soviet and East European journalists, party theoreticians and "hack" writers, who can be expected to undermine the credibility of Western media and to substitute principles of socialist journalism, whose function is mobilizing "Third World" peoples for the class struggle. It is also true that in recent years an increasing number of articles by Latin American, African, Indian and Far Eastern writers has appeared. Even the United States is occasionally represented, usually by Herbert Schiller, professor of communications at the University of California, San Diego, whose position as the leading Marxist academic journalist in the country has made him the scourge of establishmentarian editors and publishers. Finally, there have appeared articles by senior UNESCO officials Hifzi Topuz, head of the Department of Free Circulation of Information and Communications Policy; and Gunnar Naesselund, deputy assistant director general for communications. A rigorous content analysis of these articles would probably support Sussman's claim[35] that they either support or do not conflict with the Marxist-Leninist analysis that predominates in the magazine.

An example of the Marxist-Leninism of The Democratic Journalist appeared in the January 1976 issue, in excerpts from a book by the Soviet writer G. I. Kunitsyn. "It would seem at first sight that in some capitalist countries complete freedom really exists, for there is often no central system of press control," he writes. But there is no freedom, because not only are the owners motivated by the profit system and the accompanying political system, but they also "belong to political parties." These "press bodies, too, are according to an unwritten law of general validity obliged to reflect and follow the specific type of program of the party in question."[36]

Soviet writer Azad Khadian Talivaya Ibragimov in a 1976 IOJ book contends that there are only two fundamental kinds of journalism: communist and capitalist. Recognizing that there are "diverse ideological and political streams" within the developing countries, he distinguishes five kinds of press participating in the class struggle:

> 1. The press of the national bourgeoisie [Mahatma Gandhi's Haridjan exposed colonial rule but did not go far enough; the national bourgeoisie "have the tendency to go over to the antinational or even pro-imperialist positions," Ibragimov claims]
>
> 2. The revolutionary-democratic press [as in Algeria, it strives for non-capitalist development by intensifying the national liberation struggle, but "it is not a working-class press"]
>
> 3. The communist press, which disseminates anti-imperialist ideas, "including those which have now been adopted by revolutionary democrats" [the success of a developing country's press "frequently depends" on whether it actively supports the "anti-imperialist struggle for national liberation" in cooperation with the communist press, as in Iraq]
>
> 4. The press of local monopolistic capital (i.e., The Statesman of India), which is controlled by capitalistic magnates and "can hardly be listed as national publications"
>
> 5. The press of foreign monopolistic corporations, which should be "expropriated as soon as possible." [37]

Ibragimov writes that the "nationalization of the mass media" and the "growth of the party and government press" is "in our view, a progressive development" for all countries. "The basis of the work of the press...must be the aims of national development in the political, socio-economic and cultural fields," he contends.[38]

To facilitate the "Third World's" developing of a "progressive" press, the IOJ has since 1958 conducted seminars and conferences to train journalists to accept professional and ideological responsibilities.

In 1963 in Eastern Europe it established two training centers where "Third World" journalists could receive "education of democratic, anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist" nature.[39] The College of Solidarity, operated in East Berlin by the IOJ and the Union of Journalists of the German Democratic Republic, emphasizes newspaper and periodical journalism. In 1977 The Democratic Journalist reported that "nearly 500 journalists from developing countries have earned diplomas and finished their professional studies" at the college.[40] The International Institute for Training of Journalists, located in Budapest, emphasizes broadcast media. It "has trained over 300 journalists from 38 developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America."[41] The IOJ also has operated regional training centers in Africa (since 1964), the Middle East (since 1967) and Latin America (since 1968).[42]

THE CAMPAIGN TO PENETRATE THE "THIRD WORLD" PRESS

Popov writes that from 1958 onward one of the major concerns of the IOJ "appears to have been to develop its ties with journalist groups in the developing areas."

Orth, Sussman and Popov agree that the IOJ's most noteworthy early success was in Africa. The IOJ first organized an African section at the 1958 Bucharest congress.[43] In May 1961, at Bamako, Mali, the IOJ sponsored an All-African Journalists Conference, which created the Pan-African Union of Journalists (PAJU). According to Orth, the PAJU was the first federation of "Third World" journalists controlled by the IOJ,[44] although it claimed to be organizationally independent of the IOJ. Non-communist journalists and most government representatives "boycotted" the PAJU, Orth notes.[45] A September-October 1963 international meeting of journalists, held aboard a Soviet liner cruising the Mediterranean, was no-

tably successful in attracting "non-communist participation, especially from Africans and Arabs."[46]

"The Soviet Union and its satellites succeeded in penetrating" the African press, according to Sussman, "often by invitation, as a counter balance to pervasive Western influences and often by offering communications assistance as part of a larger deal generally involving sale or loan of military equipment. The Soviets...in the sixties liberally endowed the African liberation movements with arms and supplies; and, not incidentally, with radio equipment and in some cases, printing presses and newsprint."[47] Examples of this aid are the $110 million in credits Guinea received in 1963: a radio station from the USSR, a printing plant--at that time, the biggest in Africa[48]--from East Germany, and technical aid and a radio transmitter from Czechoslovakia.[49] In the same year, Ghana received $182 million in credits for communications, a printing plant and film technicians; Tanzania received a newspaper plant from East Germany;[50] and a "solidarity collection" yielded 700,000 marks in East Germany and 2.5 million zlotys in Poland for the training of African journalists.[51]

In Latin America, the IOJ began by concluding agreements with the Union of Mexican Journalists and the Union of Journalists of Venezuela, both communist national unions, in July 1959.[52] The agreement provided for "international cooperation, exchange of information and mutual respect for ideology and religious belief."[53] At a second "world meeting" of journalists held in Baden, Austria, in October 1960, South American delegates, "most of whom represented bourgeois papers, agreed to work with the IOJ in the spirit of the latter."[54] Again, few non-communists attended the conference, and several delegations walked out in protest of "one-sided political resolutions."[55] In January 1962 the IOJ organized

a Commission for Information and Cooperation among Latin American Journalists (CICPLA), with headquarters in Montevideo. However, "the growing rift between Soviet and Cuban interpretations of revolutionary strategy" apparently limited IOJ influence in Latin America, and CICPLA remained "a relatively ineffective body."[56]

In Asia, the Sino-Soviet split appears to have limited IOJ inroads. In 1962 Chinese and Indonesian members split from the IOJ and in April 1963 at Bandung formed a rival organization, the Afro-Asian Journalists' Conference (AAJA). For a time the AAJA appeared to be a serious geographical rival, but its prestige declined in the aftermath of the abortive communist coup d'état in Indonesia in September 1965, after which AAJA headquarters were transferred to Peking. Though still active, the AAJA has been generally unsuccessful in winning the allegiance of IOJ members or member organizations; it "devotes its energies mainly to propagating the Chinese view on international political affairs."[57]

Through the years, IOJ delegations have visited Latin America, Asia and Africa, arranging "solidarity" conferences focused on political issues: the Korean war, Algerian liberation, Cuban defense, the Arab-Israeli conflicts, the Vietnam war, and a "Save-Chile-from-Fascism" campaign.[58] In 1969 at Pyongyang the IOJ claimed to have organized the largest meeting of "anti-imperialist" journalists in history -- 220 persons, most of them government delegates, from 90 countries.[59]

UNESCO-IOJ COLLABORATION

Schiller interprets the American-inspired drive to have the "free flow of information" principles sanctified by international agreements as a condition for the post-World War II expansion of American business "into the farthest reaches of the world capitalist system."[60]

> In the most general terms, the more articulate exponents of what seemed to be a looming American Century, envisioned a world unshackled from former colonial ties and generally accessible to the initiatives and undertakings of American private corporate enterprise....The outward thrust of United States corporate enterprise was economic but the utility of the cultural-informational component in the expansion process was appreciated at a very early stage in the drama. The rapid international advances of United States capitalism, already underway in the early 1940s, were legitimized as unexceptional and highly beneficial expressions of growing freedom in the international arena--freedom of capital, resource and information flows.[61]

Free information flows, Schiller points out, "could not only be contrasted with the fascist mode of operations, but were associated also with the hope for peace shared by war-weary peoples everywhere."[62] The campaign "to elevate the issue of free flow of information to the highest level of national and international principle" not only supported "a commercial goal expressed as an ethical imperative" but also provided "a highly effective ideological club against the Soviet Union and its newly-created neighboring zones of anti-capitalist influence."[63]

The United States made certain that the newly created UN and UNESCO would put great emphasis on the free flow issue. The UN in 1945-48, "with the exception of the USSR and the few East European states allied to it, was far from being universal, much less independent," Schiller writes. "In fact, it was distinguished by an 'automatic majority,' invoked whenever its heaviest financial supporter and economically strongest member desired to use it."[64] Thus, at its outset UNESCO created a free flow of information section in its Mass Communications Division; and in December 1946 the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution which declared that

> Freedom of information is a fundamental human right, and is a touchstone of all the freedoms to which the United Nations is consecrated.... [Freedom] implies the right to gather, transmit and publish news anywhere and everywhere without fetters.[65]

In the two decades that followed, Schiller writes,

> New communications technology...combined with a powerful and expanding corporate business system, assisted the push of the United States into the center of the world economy. Without public pronouncements, private, American-made media products and United States information networks blanketed the world....Largely as a reaction to the flood of American cultural material and the usurpation of national media systems that was required to disseminate it, a new mood with respect to the free flow of information doctrine became observable in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Besides the free flow view, there now appear frequent references to cultural sovereignty, cultural privacy, cultural autonomy, and even admissions of the possibility of cultural imperialism.[66]

As in all questions of influence, assessing the IOJ's impact on the development of this "new mood" in the "Third World" is difficult. It is possible, however, to detect a pattern of collaboration between UNESCO and the IOJ in the dialogue about "national communications policies."

As early as August 1962, at the fifth IOJ congress in Budapest--which proclaimed it would with new energy seek to assist the media of developing states "against neo-colonialist plots"[67]--a UNESCO representative "declared that there were many common aims in the two organizations and that he would inform the UNESCO Secretariat of the IOJ desire to be accepted as a consultative member."[68] That acceptance did not come until 1969.[69]

In January 1971 in Havana, the seventh IOJ congress called for more intensive work within UNESCO and by UNESCO within the IOJ.[70] In June 1974 the IOJ and UNESCO cosponsored in Budapest a colloquium on "development of communications media and new tendencies in the training of journalists."[71]

The two organizations in December 1975 produced a second colloquium, attended primarily by African journalist-trainees.[72] And in November 1977 UNESCO "appeared" to Righter to be one of the sponsors, together with the IOJ and the Iraqi union of journalists, of a conference on "decolonization of information."[73]

The IOJ opened a Paris office in 1975; it claims this office is the liaison for its "extensive cooperation" with UNESCO in that organization's many programs in the news media field. Although Righter quotes unnamed UNESCO officials as denying that the organization has either entered into combined programs with the IOJ or has sponsored IOJ activities,[74] Sussman offers a quote from the IOJ representative to UNESCO's 1976 Nairobi conference to the opposite effect:

> The world's largest journalists' organization is willing to continue its cooperation with UNESCO....The new and more universal approach taken by UNESCO means relinquishing the distinctly Western character that the organization took in the past.[75]

The February 1976 Democratic Journalist quoted UNESCO's Topuz as proposing that the IOJ and UNESCO study the "free, balanced--in the double sense--circulation of information between North and South."[76]

An example of the kind of research that might be engendered by this initiative is a study by two communications scholars at Finland's University of Tampere, one of whom is the president of the IOJ, Kaarle Nordenstreng. The study, a progress report on which was prepared for the 1978 meeting of the International Association for Mass Communication Research in Warsaw, examines the image of foreign countries "representing different social systems and developmental stages as portrayed by mass-circulated press in respective countries." Because the collected data at the time could only sustain tenative conclusions, most of the report is devoted to the development of a rigorous content analytic methodology by the

research team.

The care with which the Nordenstreng team seeks to develop the analysis underscores Nordenstreng's reputation as an internationally respected mass communications scholar. He was also one of the principal drafters of the Soviet-inspired draft declaration on use of the mass media,[77] considered by UNESCO's membership at the 1976, 1976 and 1978 conferences; the debate on the declaration has provided one of the sharper pictures of the shifting ideological alignments within UNESCO, threatening at several points to tear the organization apart. For Nordenstreng, it is a "significant tendency of our time that the social struggle between classes and historical forces will be increasingly carried out at the level of ideology, including the sphere of journalism."[78] In other words, much of the ideological bias of the "Third World" has been shaped in the arenas of international diplomacy, where in recent years the West has often been outvoted.[79] And, as an editorial in Editor & Publisher points out, UNESCO debate on the issue of state controls on media "is not going to go away." Pointing to forthcoming UNESCO-sponsored communications conferences, the writer suggests that the approval by the 1978 UNESCO Paris meeting of a compromise draft convention on mass media represented not a "victory" for the West over the Soviet bloc but only "a gratifying reprieve in the ideological struggle which will continue for years to come."[80]

CONCLUSIONS

As outlined by the IOJ and a "group of institutes with an increasingly large audience among developing countries' leaders,"[81] a "New International Information Order" would echo the Soviet theory of the role of information in important respects.

Domestically, ownership of the press would be vested in "the people":

collectives of workers, unions, the political party and other extensions of state organization. (Righter points out that the "Third World" leaders who insist that they reject both Western and Soviet models of information--such as Libya--are installing "the people" in the systems in very much the Soviet way, while claiming that the Soviet media are governmental and theirs are not.[82]) The media would have a didactic role--inculcating social virtues and criticizing "selfish individualism, proprietary instincts and monopolism," while mobilizing the masses for their daily tasks.

The main reason that this can be presented as a model for a "New Order," rather than the familiar Soviet one, is that "Third World" conditions change the nature of the task of mobilization, or at the least, modify it. As Righter argues,

> News in the service of development is not necessarily identical with building socialism. But the distinction is a fine one. In many developing countries, little editing would be required to adopt the basic principles set out by Tass: "information must serve the interests of the entire people....[It] plays an important role in the communist education of working people, in the forming of public opinion, in the correct orientation of people in questions of domestic and foreign policy of the Party and the State, in the struggle against hostile ideology."[83]

Uncertainties as to how a "New Order" might evolve, however, cloud the view from Moscow of the oft-proclaimed solidarity between socialist countries and the "Third World."[84] One of the reasons for the pronounced efforts on the cultural and information fronts made by Soviet-supported organizations like the IOJ is the determination to see that the development of concepts, as yet not fully formed, underpinning the "New Order for Information" does not carry with it a firm rejection of Soviet as well as Western influence.

Rejection may be in name only; the Soviet model, with local variants, is likely to be attractive to governments, whether Marxist or not.

At least, the "New Order for Information" objectively echoes aspects of the Soviet approach. The central point is that, in practice, information integrated into national development programs is likely to be closely directed by governments, many of which may be more concerned with perpetuating themselves in power than with addressing indigenous needs. Information, when it supports "freedom for the working masses," may become--in the words of a former Tass director, M. Poulgounov--"agitational writing, aided by facts."[45]

FOOTNOTES

[1]Leonard Sussman, "Developmental Journalism: The Ideological Factor," in The Third World and Press Freedom (Medford, Mass.: Edward R. Murrow Center of Public Diplomacy, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, 1977), p. 8. Sussman's paper was one of 17 presented at a conference of mass communications specialists May 11-13, 1977, in New York.

[2]Ibid., p. 12.

[3]Witold Sworakowski, World Communism: A Handbook 1918-1965 (Stanford, Calif.: Hoover Institution Press, 1973), p. 211.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Robert Orth, International Communist Front Organizations (Munich: Ilmgau Verflag Pfaffenhofen/ILM, 1963), pp. 10-11.

[6]Bernard S. Morris, "Communist International Front Organizations: Their Nature and Function," World Politics, IX, No. 1 (October 1956), 79.

[7]Sworakowski, p. 211.

[8]Leonard Sussman, Mass News Media and the Third World Challenge (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1977), p. 50.

[9]Milorad Popov, "The International Organization of Journalists," in Sworakowski, p. 217.

[10]Orth, p. 136.

[11]Sussman, Mass News, p. 50.

[12]Orth, p. 136; Popov, p. 217.

[13]Popov, p. 217.

[14]Quoted in Popov, ibid.

[15]Ibid.

[16]Ibid.

[17]Orth, p. 138; Richard Staar, ed., Yearbook on International Communist Affairs, 1976 (Stanford, Calif.: Hoover Institution Press, 1976), p. 554.

[18]Popov, p. 217.

[19]Ibid.

[20]Orth, p. 139.

[21]Popov, p. 217.

[22]Richard Staar, ed., Yearbook on International Communist Affairs, 1977, p. 579.

[23]Orth, p. 136; Popov, p. 218.

[24]Orth, ibid.

[25]Ibid., p. 137.

[26]Popov, p. 218.

[27]Thirty Years of the International Organization of Journalists in Action (Prague: International Organization of Journalists, 1976), p. 5.

[28]Orth, p. 137.

[29]Staar 1976, p. 554.

[30]Staar 1977, p. 579; Popov, pp. 218-9.

[31]Popov, pp. 218-9.

[32]Sussman, Mass News, p. 51.

[33]Rosemary Righter, Whose News? Politics, Press and the Third World (New York: Times Books Inc., 1978), p. 110.

[34]See, for example, Wilbur Schramm, Mass Media and National Development (Stanford University Press and Paris: UNESCO, 1964); Tapio Varis and Kaarle Nordenstreng, International Inventory of Television Programme Structure and the Flow of Television Programmes Between Nations (University of Tampere: Institute of Journalism and Mass Communications, 1973); and Jeremy Tunstall, The Media Are American: Anglo-American Media in the World (London: Constable, 1977).

[35]Sussman, "Developmental Journalism," p. 19.

[36]Quoted by Sussman in Mass News, p. 54.

[37]Azad Khadian Talivaya Ibragimov, "The Press in the Developing Countries of Asia and Africa: Its Social and Class Character and Function," in Developing World and Mass Media (Prague: International Organization of Journalists, 1976), pp. 25-29.

[38]Ibid.

[39]Thirty Years of the IOJ, p. 19.

[40]Wolfgang Kleinwächter, "The Exchange of Information and the Developing Countries," The Democratic Journalist, September 1977, 9.

[41]"Another Course for Journalists Begins in Budapest," The Democratic Journalist, June-July 1978, 17; Staar 1977, p. 580.

[42]Sussman, "Developmental Journalism," p. 22.

[43]Sussman, Mass News, p. 51.

[44]Orth, p. 142.

[45]Ibid.

[46]Popov, p. 218.

[47]Sussman, "Developmental Journalism," p. 10.

[48]Orth, p. 143.

[49]Sussman, "Developmental Journalism," p. 26.

[50]Ibid.

[51]Orth, p. 143.

[52]Ibid., p. 140.

[53]Ibid., pp. 140-1.

[54]Ibid.

[55]Popov, p. 218.

[56]Ibid.

[57]Staar 1977, p. 580.

[58]Sussman, Mass News, p. 52.

[59]Ibid.

[60]Herbert I. Schiller, "Genesis of the Free Flow of Information Principles: The Imposition of Communication Domination," The Democratic Journalist, April 1977, 7.

[61]Ibid.

[62]Ibid.

[63]Ibid., 9. See also Kent Cooper, Barriers Down: The Story of the News Agency Epoch (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1942) for a non-Marxist account of the drive by the Associated Press and United Press to break up the "spheres of influence" held by Reuters and Agence France Presse until the end of World War II.

[64]Ibid., 10.

[65]Ibid., 10. The quote is from UN Resolution 59(1), Dec. 14, 1946.

[66]Ibid., 11.

[67]Thirty Years of the IOJ, p. 13.

[68]Orth, p. 143.

[69]Sussman, Mass News, p. 50.

[70]Sussman, "Developmental Journalism," p. 22.

[71]Ibid.

[72]Ibid.

[73]Righter, p. 114.

[74]Ibid.

[75]Sussman, "Developmental Journalism," p. 22.

[76]Quoted in Sussman, Mass News, p. 53. Sussman argues that "in the double sense" refers "not only to the equalizing of the volume of North-South dispatches, but 'ensured' balancing of content and viewpoint, particularly in the transmissions of the developed countries." (p. 77)

[77]Among the articles to which the West objected were Article VII, which said media have the "duty" to mobilize international opinion behind the new international economic order and which sanctioned use of media by governments as a matter of principle; Article X, which said that states which considered that "circulation of erroneous news reports hindered the pursuit of the high ideals of the draft declaration, should have the right to rectify them through the media; and Article XII, which said that"states are responsible for activities in the international sphere of all mass media under their jurisdiction." (Righter, p. 135)

[78]Kaarle Nordenstreng, "Historical Tendencies on Our Side," The Democratic Journalist, January-February 1977, 2.

[79]For example, on Nov. 15, 1972, the 17th General Conference of UNESCO adopted a "Declaration of Guiding Principles on the Use of Space Broadcasting for the Free Flow of Information, the Spread of Education, and Greater Cultural Exchange." Direct satellite broadcasting is often cited as exemplar of the challenge to national sovereignty by "Third World" media specialists. "The philosophy of the declaration is strongly restrictive, stressing sovereignty, the requirement that news broadcasts be accurate, the right of each country to decide the contents of educational programs broadcast to it, the need for broadcasters to respect cultural distinctiveness and varied laws, and the requirement for prior consent especially regarding advertising. The declaration was adopted by a vote of 55 to 7 with 22 abstentions. The U. S. was in the minority." (Ithiel de Sola Pool, "Direct Broadcast Satellites and the Integrity of National Cultures," in Kaarle Nordenstreng and Herbert I. Schiller, eds., National Sovereignty and International Communication (Norwood, N. J.: Ablex Publishing, 1979), p. 130.

[80]Robert U. Brown, "Another Soviet Curve Ball," Editor & Publisher, Dec. 2, 1978, 44.

[81]According to Righter, p. 112, these institutes include the Dag Hammarskjold Foundation (Finland) and the Latin American-based CIESPAL and IIET (Latin American Institute for Transnational Studies).

[82]Righter, pp. 112-3.

[83]Ibid., p. 113.

[84]Ibid.

[85]Quoted by Righter, ibid., p. 114.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Another Course for Journalists Begins in Budapest." The Democratic Journalist, June-July 1978, 17.

Brown, Robert U. "Another Soviet Curve Ball." Editor & Publisher, Dec. 2, 1978, 44.

Ibragimov, Azad Khadian Talivaya. "The Press in the Developing Countries of Asia and Africa: Its Social and Class Character and Function." In Developing World and Mass Media. Prague: International Organization of Journalists, 1976.

Kleinwächter, Wolfgang. "The Exchange of Information and the Developing Countries." The Democratic Journalist, September 1977, 6-9.

Morris, Bernard S. "Communist International Front Organizations: Their Nature and Function." World Politics, IX, No. 1 (October 1956), 76-87.

Nordenstreng, Kaarle. "Historical Tendencies on Our Side." The Democratic Journalist, January-February 1977, 1-2.

Nordenstreng, Kaarle, and Herbert I. Schiller. National Sovereignty and International Communication. Norwood, N. J.: Ablex Publishing, 1979.

Orth, Robert. International Communist Front Organizations. Munich: Ilmgau Verflag Pfaffenhofen/ILM, 1963.

Righter, Rosemary. Whose News? Politics, the Press and the Third World. New York: Times Books Inc., 1978.

Schiller, Herbert I. "Genesis of Free Flow of Information Principles: The Imposition of Communication Domination." The Democratic Journalist, April 1977, 7-12.

Staar, Richard F., ed. Yearbook on International Communist Affairs, 1976, 1977. Stanford, Calif.: Hoover Institution Press, 1976, 1977.

Sussman, Leonard. "Developmental Journalism: The Ideological Factor." In The Third World and Press Freedom. Medford, Mass.: Edward R. Murrow Center of Public Diplomacy, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, 1977.

_____. Mass News Media and the Third World Challenge. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1977.

Sworakowski, Witold. World Communism: A Handbook 1918-1965. Stanford, Calif.: Hoover Institution Press, 1973.

Thirty Years of the International Organization of Journalists in Action. Prague: International Organization of Journalists, 1976.